

PATENT

KOYOP101USA

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being submitted *via* the USPTO EFS Filing System on the date shown below to Mail Stop **Appeal Brief-Patents**, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Date March 9, 2007

Casey L. Martin/
Casey L. Martin

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent application of:

Appellant(s): Jeasung Jay Yoo

Examiner: Alissa L. Hoey

Serial No: 10/772,610

Art Unit: 3765

Filing Date: February 5, 2004

Title: GARMENT AND DETACHABLE GARMENT LINER HAVING A SECURE
AND INTEGRATED POCKET SYSTEM

**Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

LETTER RE SECOND EXAMINER'S ANSWER OF FEBRUARY 13, 2007

Dear Sir:

Appellants' representative submits this letter to clarify an issue in connection with an appeal of the above-identified patent application. In the event any additional fees may be due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [KOYOP101USA].

Examiner's Answers Dated December 7, 2006 and February 13, 2007

An Examiner's Answer dated December 7, 2006 had been received in response to Appellant's Appeal Brief. A Reply Brief responsive to the Examiner's Answer was transmitted to the PTO on January 29, 2007, and acknowledgement had been received. A second Examiner's Answer was received dated February 13, 2007. The second Examiner's Answer is identical to the first with the exception of section (8). In the first Examiner's Answer, section (8) stated that no evidence was relied upon by the Examiner in the rejection of the claims under appeal. The second Examiner's Answer lists the prior art of record as evidence.

Appellant acknowledges the new citation of evidence in the Examiner's Answer of February 13, 2007. This second Examiner's Answer does not indicate that it should supersede the first Examiner's Answer, nor is it indicated that this document is responsive to the Reply Brief. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the Reply Brief submitted January 29, 2007 is complete and fully responsive to both Examiner's Answers, and therefore a second Reply Brief is not necessary. Appellant respectfully requests that the Appeal proceed as indicated.

CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, it is maintained that the claims currently under consideration are believed to be patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 1-12 and 27-28 be reversed.

If any additional fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. [KOYOP101USA].

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24th Floor, National City Center
1900 East 9th Street
Telephone: (216) 696-8730
Facsimile: (216) 696-8731